



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,586	02/17/2004	Jonathan E. Rivers-Moore	MS306941.01	3412
69316	7590	01/09/2008	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052			HUYNH, THU V	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2178			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
01/09/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/781,586	RIVERS-MOORE ET AL.
	Examiner Thu V. Huynh	Art Unit 2178

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 18,21-34,36-44 and 50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 18,21-34,36-44 and 50 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/9/07, 10/16/07, 12/20/07.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: IDS filed on 8/9/07, 10/16/07, 12/20/07 and RCE filed on 10/16/07 to application filed on 02/17/04.
2. Claims 1-17, 19-20, 35 and 45-49 are canceled.
3. Claims 18 and 41 are currently amended. Claim 50 are currently added.
4. Claims 18, 21-34, 36-44 and 50 are pending in the case. Claims 18 and 41 are independent claims.
5. Rejections in the previous office action have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 8/9/07, 10/16/07, 12/20/07 are considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were

made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 18, 21, 24, 27-30, 36-41, 44, 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bell et al., US 7,168,035 B1, filed 06/11/03, in view of Paoli et al., US2004/0268229, filed 06/27/03

The applied reference has common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention “by another”; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Regarding independent claim 18, Bell teaches the steps of:

- presenting extensible markup language (XML) data of a first XML document in a user interface having form display area, a component selection tool, and a data source area (Bell, figures 2, 8-9, col.3, lines 62-67, form display area 112, component selection tool 110 and data source area 108) having:
- the form display area displays the XML data of the first XML document in an electronic form representation having one or more data-entry fields representing one or more nodes of the first XML document (Bell; figures 2, 8-27; col.2, lines 52-57; col.4, lines 31-65; display XML data in electronic form having field/node "String 1" in area 112);
- the component selection tool is selectable to permit a designer to insert and place components into the form display area for inclusion in the first XML document (Bell, col.4, lines 52-64, col.15, lines 4-20; selecting a suggested component to be inserted and placed to the electronic form);
- the data source area displays the XML data of the first XML document in a hierarchical tree presentation concurrently with the electronic form presentation of the first XML document in the form display area (Bell, figures 9, 11, "Data Source" comprising "String1");
- enabling one or more operations through interaction with a component in the electronic form representation (Bell, figures 25-26; col.15, lines 4-20; "cut, copy, paste, change to, etc." operations); and

- receiving selection of an operation of the one or more operations (Bell, figures 25-26; col.15, lines 4-20; selecting “change to” a suggested component to insert and placed in the electronic form);
- modifying the XML data of the first XML document corresponding to the component in the electronic form based on the received operation (Bell, Bell, figures 25-27; col.15, lines 4-20; modifying the XML data to insert and placed in the electronic form) wherein
 - o the act of presenting comprises determining that a node of the first XML document corresponding to the component is identified in a first element in a second XML document (Bell, “String 1” field is specified in hierarchical element “String1” that have a list of suggested components); and
 - o the act of enabling comprises determining that the operations are identified in a second element associated with the first element in the second XML document (Bell, figures 25-27, the operations are identified in “String1” element in the hierarchical).

However, Bell does not teach the act of modifying the XML data cause modifications to the XML data to be concurrently reflected in the electronic form representation and the hierachal view representation.

Paoli teaches modifying the XML data cause modifications to the XML data to be concurrently reflected in the electronic form representation and the hierachal view representation (Paoli, abstract, claim 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Paoli's teaching and Bell's teaching to reflect changes in the electronic form as well as in the hierarchical, since the combination would have facilitated the creating, editing data in the electronic form.

Regarding claim 21, which is dependent on claim 18, Bell does not explicitly teach determining that the node is identified comprises determining that the first element comprises a character string "xmltoEdit".

However, Bell teaches an element comprises character string "String1" or icon to identify a node (Bell, col.9, line 61 – col.10, line 65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell's teaching to include any character string to identify the node, since the modification would have provided the user different hints to modify/edit the node.

Regarding claim 24, which is dependent on claim 18, Bell does not explicitly teach determining that the second element comprises a character string of "editWith".

However, Bell teaches an element comprises character string "xhtml" or icon to identify a node (Bell, col.9, line 61 – col.10, line 65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell's teaching to include any character string to identify

the node, since the modification would have provided the user different hints to modify the node.

Regarding claim 27, which is dependent on claim 18, Bell teach the first XML document comprises data not represented with XML (Bell, fig.11, dropdown icon image 1102).

Regarding dependent claim 28, which is dependent on claim 18, Bell teaches determining that the second element comprises an attribute indicating that the operations comprise insertion or deletion of the identified node, or of a sibling node to the identified node (Bell, figures 25-26; “cut, copy, paste, change to, etc.” operations).

Regarding dependent claims 29, which is dependent on claim 28, Bell does not explicitly teach the value of the attribute comprise a character string of “xCollection”.

However, Bell teaches the value of the attribute comprise a character string of “Drop-Down List Box” to insert a node (Bell, fig. 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell’s teaching to include any character string to insert a node, since the modification would have provided the user the different hints to modify the node.

Regarding dependent claims 30, which is dependent on claim 28, Bell does not explicitly teach the value of the attribute comprise a character string of “xOptional”.

However, Bell teaches the value of the attribute comprise a character string of “Drop-Down List Box” to insert a node (Bell, fig. 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell’s teaching to include any character string to insert a node, since the modification would have provided the user the different hints to modify the node.

Regarding dependent claims 36, which is dependent on claim 18, Bell does not explicitly teach determining that the second element comprises an attribute indicating that the operations comprise addition to or alteration of data within the identified node.

However, Bell teaches the value of the attribute comprise a character string of “Drop-Down List Box” to insert a node (Bell, fig. 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell’s teaching to include any character string to insert a node, since the modification would have provided the user the different hints to modify the node.

Regarding dependent claims 37, which is dependent on claim 36, Bell does not explicitly teach determining that the second element comprises an attribute comprises determining that a value of the attribute comprises a character string “xField”

However, Bell teaches the value of the attribute comprise a character string of “Drop-Down List Box” to insert a node (Bell, fig. 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell's teaching to include any character string to insert a node, since the modification would have provided the user the different hints to modify the node.

Regarding dependent claims 38, which is dependent on claim 37, Bell does not explicitly teach determining that the second element comprises a second attribute having a character string of "type".

However, Bell teaches the value of the attribute comprise a character string of "Drop-Down List Box" to insert a node (Bell, fig. 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell's teaching to include any character string to insert a node, since the modification would have provided the user the different hints to modify the node.

Regarding dependent claim 39, which is dependent on claim 38. Bell teaches determining that the second attribute is associated with a character string of "text" and the act of enabling one or more operations comprises enabling creation and modification of text within the identified node (Bell, figures 25-27). However, Bell does not explicitly teach the character string is "rich" and the text is rich text data.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell's teaching to include any character string to enabling

creation of text or rich text data, since the modification would have provided the user the different types of data, such as text, rich text, plain text, image, etc. to modify the node.

Regarding dependent claims 40, which is dependent on claim 38, Bell teaches determining that the second attribute is associated with a character string of “text” and the act of enabling one or more operations comprises enabling creation and modification of text within the identified node (Bell, figures 25-27). However, Bell does not explicitly teach the character string is “plain” and the text is plain text data.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell’s teaching to include any character string to enabling creation of text or rich text data, since the modification would have provided the user the different types of data such as text, rich text, plain text, image, etc. to modify the node. It is noted that text includes rich text and plain text format is well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Regarding independent claim 41, Bell teaches determining that:

- outputting a user interface having a form display area, a data source area, and a component selection tool (Bell, figures 2, 8-9, col.3, lines 62-67, form display area 112, component selection tool 110 and data source area 108);
- presenting a first extensible markup language (XML) document in the form display area as an electronic form having one or more data-entry field representing one or more nodes of the first XML document, the user interface including another portion

concurrently displayable with the first portion to display the first XML document in a hierarchical tree representation (Bell, figures 2, 8-9, col.3, lines 62-67, form display area 112, component selection tool 110 and data source area 108));

- presenting the first XML document in a hierarchical tree representation in the data source area (Bell, figures 9, 11, hierarchical tree in “Data Source”);
- enabling an operation to be performed on one of the nodes through its data-entry field (Bell, figures 25-26; col.15, lines 4-20; “cut, copy, paste, change to, etc.” operations), wherein:
 - o the one node is identified in an element comprising a character string in a second XML document (Bell, figures 8-27; determining that the node, is identified in XML hierarchical structure document, wherein the node comprise character string or the name of the node);
 - o the operation enabled to be performed on the one node is identified in a child element of the element, the child element comprising a character string (Bell, figures 8-27; identifying child node of a parent node in the hierarchical tree, the child node comprising character string); and
 - o when performed, the operation enable to be performed causes a modification of data corresponding to the one node in the first XML document, the modification being concurrently reflected in the electronic form and the hierachal tree representation (Bell, figures 8-27, changing a node or adding a child to a node is reflected in the electronic form).

However, Bell does not explicitly disclose the strings are “xmlToEdit” and “editWith” strings and the modification being concurrently reflected in the hierarchical tree.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell’s teaching to include any character string to identify the node, since the modification would have provided the user different hints to modify/edit the node.

Paoli teaches modifying the XML data cause modifications to the XML data to be concurrently reflected in the electronic form representation and the hierachal view representation (Paoli, abstract, claim 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Paoli’s teaching and Bell’s teaching to reflect changes in the electronic form as well as in the hierarchical, since the combination would have facilitated the creating, editing data in the electronic form.

Regarding dependent claims 44, which is dependent on claim 41, Bell teaches enabling the operation comprises enabling the operation only if the electronic form comprises a representation of a context node, and wherein the context node is identified in a “container” attribute of an element (Bell, figures 13-16). However, Bell does not explicitly disclose the element is “xmlToEdit” element.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bell’s teaching to include any character string to identify

the node, since the modification would have provided the user different hints to modify/edit the node.

Regarding independent claim 50, Bell teaches the steps of:

- outputting a user interface to present an extensible markup language (XML) document the user interface including: (Bell, figures 2, 8-9, col.3, lines 62-67, form display area 112, component selection tool 110 and data source area 108) having:
- a form display area displays an electronic form representation of the XML document (Bell; figures 2, 8-27; col.2, lines 52-57; col.4, lines 31-65; display XML data in electronic form having field/node "String 1" in area 112);
- a component selection tool selectively displayable to operable by a user to select components for the electronic form representation including one or more data entry field components for inclusion in the XML document (Bell, col.4, lines 52-64, col.15, lines 4-20; suggested component list);
- responsive to user interaction with the component tool, receiving a selection of one or more components and arranging the one or more components in the electronic form representation of the XML document in form display area (Bell, col.4, line 65 - col.5, line 4; col.10, lines 25-65; ranking suggested component list);
- enabling one or more operations through interaction with a component in the electronic form representation (Bell, figures 25-26; col.15, lines 4-20; "cut, copy, paste, change to, etc." operations); and

- receiving selection of an operation of the one or more operations (Bell, figures 25-26; col.15, lines 4-20; selecting “change to” a suggested component to insert and placed in the electronic form);
- modifying the XML data of the first XML document corresponding to the component in the electronic form based on the received operation (Bell, Bell, figures 25-27; col.15, lines 4-20; modifying the XML data to insert and placed in the electronic form).

However, Bell does not teach the act of modifying the XML data cause modifications to the XML data to be concurrently reflected in the electronic form representation and the hierachal view representation.

Paoli teaches modifying the XML data cause modifications to the XML data to be concurrently reflected in the electronic form representation and the hierachal view representation (Paoli, abstract, claim 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Paoli’s teaching and Bell’s teaching to reflect changes in the electronic form as well as in the hierarchical, since the combination would have facilitated the creating, editing data in the electronic form.

10. **Claims 22-23, 31-34 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell and Paoli as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Britton et al., US 2003/0018668 A1, filed 07/20/01.**

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent on claim 18, Bell teaches determining that a location of the node matches an Xpath expression (Bell, col.5, line 60 – col.6, line 9). However, Bell does not teach Xpath expression determinable from a value of an attribute on the first element

Britton teaches element comprises a character string of “take-effect” and that a value associated with that character string is usable to determine an Xpath expression matching a location of the node (Britton, [0072]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Britton’s teaching and Bell’s teaching, since the combination would have pinpointed the specific node located in the XML document using a value of an attribute on the element.

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent on claim 18, Bell teaches determining that the first element comprises a character string and that a value associated with that character string is usable to determine an Xpath expression matching a location of the node (Bell, col.5, line 60 – col.6, line 9). However, Bell does not explicitly disclose the character string is “item”.

Britton teaches element comprises a character string of “take-effect” and that a value associated with that character string is usable to determine an Xpath expression matching a location of the node (Britton, [0072]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Britton’s teaching and Bell’s teaching to include any

character string attribute for the node/element and using Xpath, since the combination would have pinpointed the specific node located in the XML document.

Regarding dependent claim 31, which is dependent on claim 28, Bell teaches determining that the second element indicates that the operations comprise insertion of the nodes and a location where the nodes are to be inserted based on an Xpath expression (Bell, figures, 25-27 and col.5, line 60 – col.6, line 9). Bell does not teach character string in the first element is treatable as an Xpath expression.

Britton teaches element comprises a character string of “take-effect” and that a value associated with that character string is usable to determine an Xpath expression matching a location of the node (Britton, [0072]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Britton’s teaching and Bell’s teaching to include any character string attribute for the node/element and using Xpath, since the combination would have pinpointed the specific node located in the XML document.

Regarding dependent claims 32, which is dependent on claim 28, Bell teaches determining a location for the insertion with an Xpath expression associated with a character string in the first element (Bell, col.5, line 60 – col.6, line 9).

Britton teaches element comprises a character string of “take-effect” and that a value associated with that character string is usable to determine an Xpath expression matching a location of the node (Britton, [0072]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Britton's teaching and Kutay's teaching to include any character string attribute for the node/element and using Xpath, since the combination would have pinpointed the specific node located in the XML document.

Regarding dependent claims 33, which is dependent on claim 28, Bell teaches clicking on a child element comprising a character string to edit the node (Bell, col.5, line 60 – col.6, line 9; col.10, lines 39-65). However, Kutay does not explicitly teach determining the identified node or the sibling of the identified node using a child element of the second element, and the character string “chooseFragment”.

Britton teaches element comprises a character string of “take-effect” and that a value associated with that character string is usable to determine an Xpath expression matching a location of the node (Britton, [0072]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Britton's teaching and Kutay's teaching to include any character string attribute for the node/element and using Xpath, since the combination would have pinpointed the specific node located in the XML document.

Regarding dependent claims 34, which is dependent on claim 33, Bell teaches determining a location for inserting the identified node or the sibling of the identified node (Bell, col.5, line 60 – col.6, line 9; col.10, lines 39-65).

Britton teaches element comprises a character string of “take-effect” and that a value associated with that character string is usable to determine an Xpath expression matching a location of the node (Britton, [0072]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Britton’s teaching and Bell’s teaching to include any character string attribute for the node/element and using Xpath, since the combination would have pinpointed the specific node located in the XML document.

Regarding dependent claims 42, which is dependent on claim 41, Bell does not explicitly teach the one node is identified by an XPath expression associated with a value of an “item” attribute in the “xmlToEdit” element.

Britton teaches Xpath expression is used to determine a location the node/element, wherein the Xpath expression is determined from a value of an attribute on the element (Britton, [0072]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Britton’s teaching and Bell’s teaching to using Xpath, since the combination would have pinpointed the specific node located in the XML document.

11. **Claims 25 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell and Paoli as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Huang, US 2004/0205592 A1, filed 08/20/02.**

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent on claim 18, Kutay teaches the second element comprises a character string (Kutay, fig. 15B, string “Click to set name”). However, Kutay does not explicitly teach the character string is “component” and a value associated with the character string, and using the value to determine the operations.

Huang teaches a second element comprises a character string and a value associated with the character string, and using the value to determine operations (Huang, figures 6A-6C; body element in XML tree 609 includes a string and associated values to edit the XML document 600).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kutay’s teaching and Huang’s teaching to include any character string and value associated with the string to determine edit the XML document.

Regarding dependent claims 43, which is dependent on claim 41, Kutay does not explicitly teach the operation to be performed is identified by a value of a “component” attribute in the child element.

Huang teaches a second element comprises a character string and a value associated with the character string, and using the value to determine operations (Huang, figures 6A-6C; body element in XML tree 609 includes a string and associated values to edit the XML document 600).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kutay’s teaching and Huang’s teaching to include any character string and value associated with the string to determine edit the XML document.

12. **Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell and Paoli as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Engel, US 2004/0163041 A1, filed 02/13/03.**

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent on claim 18, Bell teach determining that the second XML document comprises a namespace having a namespace resource indicator having a character string (Bell, col.6, lines 10-31). Bell does not teach the character string is either “microsoft” or “infopath”.

Engel teaches XML document comprises a namespace having a namespace resource indicator having a character string of either “microsoft” or “infopath” (Engle, [0169] and fig.7D).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Engel’s teaching and Bell’s teaching to include either “microsoft” or “infopath” string for the namespace, since the combination would have indicated elements are members of a namespace in the XML document.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/16/07 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue with respect to claims 18, 41 and 50 that Kutay does not teach content selection tool that permits a designer to insert and place components into the form display area for inclusion in the first XML document (Remarks, pages 15-19, 21).

However, Bell teaches such limitation as explained in the rejection above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Thu V. Huynh
January 3, 2008